



Montana Department of  
**ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY**

Brian Schweitzer, Governor

PO Box 200901 • Helena, MT 59620-0901 • (406) 444-2544 • [www.deq.mt.gov](http://www.deq.mt.gov)

November 21, 2014

STATE OF MONTANA  
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL ADDENDUM  
RFP NO.: 115004

TO BE OPENED: December 05, 2014

TITLE:

Environmental Specialist Assistance with Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for the  
CR Kendall Mine Amended Closure and Water Management Plan

ADDENDUM NO. 2

To All Offerors:

Attached are written questions received in response to this RFP. These questions, along with the State's response, become an official amendment to this RFP.

All other terms of the subject Request for Proposal remain as previously stated.

---

**Acknowledgment of Addendum:**

The offeror for this solicitation must acknowledge receipt of this addendum. This page must be submitted at the time set for the proposal opening or the proposal may be disqualified from further consideration.

I acknowledge receipt of Addendum No.1.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Company Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Sincerely,

  
Vicki J. Woodrow, Contracts Officer

Section Number	Question/Answer
	<p><b>Q 1.</b> Please clarify if any review of the permit amendment application will be required as part of this contract. Its review is required in some parts of the RFP and not in others.</p> <p><b>A 1.</b> No review of the permit amendment will be required. Any reference to such a review in the RFP is incorrect and inadvertently overlooked for removal by the State in preparation of the new RFP.</p>
	<p><b>Q 2.</b> What date was the draft permit amendment application accepted as complete and compliant by DEQ?</p> <p><b>A 2.</b> DEQ has not made a final complete and compliant determination regarding Kendall's amendment application. A draft of the document will be posted to the OneStop Vendor website for reference.</p>
	<p><b>Q 3.</b> Please clarify the level of socioeconomic analysis requested on page 15 of the RFP for the "need and use of existing structures for post-mine use."</p> <p><b>A 3.</b> A qualitative analysis is required for all socio-economic impacts including the need for and potential post-mine use of existing structures.</p>
	<p><b>Q 4.</b> What wildlife species would DEQ like evaluated in the updated analysis requested?</p> <p><b>A 4.</b> Post mining land use is wildlife habitat. Wildlife species recorded on and adjacent to the mine are typical of species in Central Montana that occupy mountain ranges and habitats transitional to prairie grasslands and agricultural land. Some of the wildlife in the area consists of elk, mule deer, white-tailed deer, antelope, mountain lion, sharp-tailed grouse, pheasant, gray partridge and turkey (among others). With the possible exception of raptors and bats no T&amp;E species or species of special concern are known to exist in the vicinity of the permit boundary. An updated search for T&amp;E and species of concern with the Natural Heritage Program is required.</p>
	<p><b>Q 5.</b> Will DEQ accept an alternative cost estimate that provides results for the identified primary (boldface print) cost categories shown in the RFP template? If DEQ insists on this format, will you please provide an electronic template for the costing spreadsheet?</p> <p><b>A 5.</b> The state requires cost estimates to be in the format provided. A copy of that form will be posted to the State's OneStop Vendor website.</p>
	<p><b>Q 6.</b> Will the Contractor be expected to evaluate any public comments from the public information kickoff meeting in the EIS analysis?</p> <p><b>A 6.</b> Yes</p>

	<p><b>Q 6.</b> Will the initial “public information” meeting be a scoping meeting in the sense of MEPA; i.e., will comments and concerns be collected and analyzed?</p> <p><b>A 6.</b> The public information meeting will not be a scoping meeting. DEQ will provide information on the project and where we are in the process, and accept comments in both written and oral form.</p>
	<p><b>Q 7.</b> Is the Soil Chemistry Technical Memo primarily limited to potential causes of impacts (if any) to vegetation in the land application area?</p> <p><b>A 7.</b> No</p>
	<p><b>Q 8.</b> Does the Soil Chemistry Technical Memo need to address potential mobilization or leaching of any primary (thallium) or secondary (antimony, arsenic, selenium, etc.) constituents of concern from either the land application or pad cover soils to groundwater?</p> <p><b>A 8.</b> The Technical memo will require evaluation of the past soil chemistry summary report (Tetra Tech 2006). CR Kendall’s 2013 Annual Report indicates 38,000 cubic yards of soil are available for final reclamation. Of that, 22,000 cubic yards are scheduled for use in final reclamation, leaving 16,000 cubic yards available for other potential uses. Evaluation of the potential use of 16,000 cubic yards on backfilled portions of Muleshoe and Kendall pits will be required, as well as potential use for repair of erosional features.</p>
	<p><b>Q 9.</b> Does the Soil Chemistry Technical Memo need to address issues of soil fertility of the cap coversoil and/or land application areas?</p> <p><b>A 9.</b> No.</p>